



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/808,738

03/25/2004

Patrick K. Egan

ROC920040049US1

5877

46797 7590 03/12/2007

IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

BONURA, TIMOTHY M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2114

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

03/12/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/808,738	Applicant(s) EGAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Tim Bonura	Art Unit 2114	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 8-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- **Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura and further in view of Mullins, et al, U.S. Patent Number 6,832,324.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura and further in view of Mullins, et al, U.S. Patent Number 6,832,324.

4. Regarding claim 1:

- a. Regarding the limitation of "a service processor," Nakamura disclose a system with a controller for controlling a UPS. (Lines 42-46 of Column 4).

- b. Regarding the limitation of "a system resource controlled by the service processor, wherein the system resource has a predetermined power requirement," Nakamura disclose a system a controller with can regulate the power via an operational control panel. (Lines 46-50 of Column 4).

- c. Regarding the limitation of “an uninterruptible power supply (UPS) device for supplying power to the system resource in the event of input power failure, the UPS device comprising a processor configured for supplying the service processor with information regarding the capability of the UPS device to power the system resource,” Nakamura disclose a system with a UPS with the ability to communicate with a controller information about the status of the UPS. (Lines 60-67 of Column 5 and Lines 1-10 of Column 6). Nakamura does not disclose that the system can communicate with a processor configure to supply information from the UPS to the system. However, Mullins discloses a system where power-supply data about the status of the UPS from the UPS to the system. (Lines 66-67 of Column 2 and Lines 1-15 of Column 2, Item 100 of Figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the art of Nakamura's UPS backup power supply with Mullins data sending of power supply information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because the information in the serial and part number can provide useful information such as hardware revision, system type, and firmware revision. (Lines 30-40 of Column 10).
5. Regarding claim 2, Nakamura disclose a system wherein a power calculation is made to determine the amount of power available in the battery of the UPS for both AC and DC power. (Lines 7-21 of Column 8).
6. Regarding claim 3, Nakamura discloses a system wherein the UPS will communicate to the computer system that power is about to run out in the battery and the system will start a shutdown. (Lines 48-55 of Column 9).
7. Regarding claim 4, Nakamura disclose a system with a battery life register for storing battery lifetime predicted by the controller. (Lines 55-60 of Column 6).

8. Regarding claim 5:

d. Regarding the limitation of "a processor," Nakamura disclose a system with a controller for controlling a UPS. (Lines 42-46 of Column 4).

e. Regarding the limitation of "a memory operatively connected to the processor, the memory for storing information regarding the output capability of the UPS device," Nakamura disclose a system with a controller for controlling a UPS, the system having a memory for storing battery efficiencies. (Lines 42-46 of Column 4 and Lines 13-14 of Column 7).

f. Regarding the limitation of "a source of back-up power," Nakamura discloses a system with a UPS. (Lines 58-65 of Column 3).

g. Regarding the limitation of "a converter for converting the back-up power into output power for use by an external system," Nakamura discloses a system with a DC to AC power converter for converting DC battery power into AC power for the computer system. (Lines 10-22 of Column 6).

h. Regarding the limitation of "a communications port operatively connected to the processor; wherein the processor is for controlling the communication port to output to a service processor, the information regarding the output capability of the UPS device, wherein the service processor is configured to issue control signals to the external system," Nakamura disclose a system with a UPS with the ability to communicate with a controller information about the status of the UPS. (Lines 60-67 of Column 5 and Lines 1-10 of Column 6). Nakamura does not disclose that the system can communicate with a processor configure to supply information from the UPS to the system. However, Mullins discloses a system where power-supply data about the status of the UPS from the UPS to the system. (Lines 66-67 of Column 2 and Lines 1-15 of Column 2, Item 100 of Figure

2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the art of Nakamura's UPS backup power supply with Mullins data sending of power supply information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because the information in the serial and part number can provide useful information such as hardware revision, system type, and firmware revision. (Lines 30-40 of Column 10). Mullins discloses that the PSU can send control signals to the SES processors that gather the data for analysis by the host system. (Lines 3-15 of Column 3).

9. Regarding claim 6, Nakamura discloses a system in which the communication port can communicate information identify the status of the UPS. (Lines 2-18 of Column 7).

10. Regarding claim 7, Nakamura disclose a system with a serial port for communications. (Lines 45-50 of Column 7). However, it would be inherent that the communication port for the UPS could be one of any modern standard, including an Internet connection.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 8-20 are allowed.

12. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

13. Regarding claim 8, the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest the claims read as a whole with the limitation of "an uninterruptible power supply (UPS) for supplying output AC power and for supplying UPS information comprising a UPS identifier and UPS output capability information." The response by the applicant (12/19/2006, page 8) provides details concerning the limitation and difference with the prior art.

14. Regarding claim 14, the prior art of record failed to teach or suggest the claims read as a whole with the limitation of "a second uninterruptible power supply (UPS) for supplying

Art Unit: 2114

emergency power on a second power connection and for supplying second UPS information comprising a second UPS identifier and second UPS output capability information; a first system resource operatively connected to the first power connection, the first system resource having predetermined emergency power requirements; a second system resource operatively connected to the second power connection the second system resource having predetermined emergency power requirements; and a service processor controlled by operating software having power microcode for: identifying the first system resource as being connected to the first power and identifies the second system resource as being connected to the second power connection, receiving the first UPS information and the second UPS information, determining the emergency power requirements of the first and second system resources, and determining whether the first UPS can reliably supply emergency power to the first system resource and whether the second UPS can reliably supply emergency power to the second system resource.”

15. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled “Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance.”

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments, filed 12/19/2006, with respect to claims 8-13 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of claims 8-13 have been withdrawn. Please refer to the reasons for allowance for further details.

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The amendment by the applicant necessitated a new ground of rejection by the examiner.

Conclusion

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

19. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Tim Bonura**.

- The examiner can normally be reached on **Mon-Fri: 8:30-5:00**.
- The examiner can be reached at: **571-272-3654**.

21. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, please contact the examiner's supervisor, **Scott Baderman**.

- The supervisor can be reached on **571-272-3644**.

22. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are:

- **703-872-9306 for all patent related correspondence by FAX**.

23. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 2114

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov/>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

24. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **receptionist** whose telephone number is: **571-272-2100**.

25. Responses should be mailed to:

- **Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

tmb

March 5, 2007



SCOTT BADERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER